

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
SOUTHERN DIVISION
No. 7:25-CV-219-BO

LEONARD WILLIAM HOUSTON,
Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)

ORDER

This cause comes before the Court on the memorandum and recommendation (M&R) of United States Magistrate Judge Robert T. Numbers, II. [DE 5]. Plaintiff has responded, [DE 6], and the matter is ripe for disposition.

BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, proceeding in this action *pro se*, filed a short form complaint on January 13, 2025, alleging a claim against the United States under the Camp Lejeune Justice Act (CLJA). Magistrate Judge Numbers granted plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, but has recommended that this case be dismissed as duplicative of an earlier filed complaint by plaintiff. *See Houston v. United States*, No. 7:23-CV-1202-BO (E.D.N.C.). Plaintiff has responded to the M&R, indicating that he accepts, without objection, the magistrate judge's recommendation.

DISCUSSION

"The Federal Magistrates Act requires a district court to make a de novo determination of those portions of the magistrate judge's report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (cleaned up) (emphasis omitted); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). A party's objections must be made "with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert


the district court of the true ground for the objection.” *United States v. Midgette*, 478 F.3d 616, 622 (4th Cir. 2007). “[W]hen reviewing pro se objections to a magistrate’s recommendation, district courts must review de novo any articulated grounds to which the litigant appears to take issue.” *Elijah v. Dunbar*, 66 F.4th 454, 460–61 (4th Cir. 2023). Where no specific objections have been filed, the court reviews for clear error only. *Dunlap v. TM Trucking of the Carolinas, LLC*, 288 F. Supp. 3d 654, 662 (D.S.C. 2017). On clear error review, the court has no obligation to explain its reasoning for adopting the recommendation. *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983).

Because plaintiff has not objected to the M&R, the Court reviews it only for clear error. Having discerned no clear error, the recommendation of the magistrate judge is adopted.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the memorandum and recommendation [DE 5] is ADOPTED. The complaint is DISMISSED as duplicative. The clerk is DIRECTED to close this case.

SO ORDERED, this 25 day of March 2025.


TERRENCE W. BOYLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE